

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/633,328	08/01/2003	Kam Fai Fung	884.0198USU	4199
7590 05/13/2005			EXAMINER	
Charles N.J. Ruggiero, Esq.			DOAN, ROBYN KIEU	
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P. 10th Floor			ART UNIT	DADED MUMBER
			ARTONII	PAPER NUMBER
One Landmark Square			3732	
Stamford, CT 06901-2682			DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
055	10/633,328	FUNG, KAM FAI				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robyn Doan	3732				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 A	ugust 2003.					
	action is non-final.					
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
	0) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/17/05.	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	atent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3732

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 4, 6, 10 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pao (4137926) in view of Warner et al (5339477).

With regard to claims 1-3, 4, 6, 10 and 12-13, Pao discloses a nail care system (figs. 1-2 and 5) comprising a hand tool (fig. 2) being operated by a battery (3, 4) and having a controller (8), a plurality of adapter heads (48, 49) for interfacing with the hand tool, one of the adapter heads being a rotary motion adapter head, a base housing (39, fig. 5) having a storage compartment (41) for storing the hand powered tool and the plurality of motion adapter heads (fig. 5), the system further comprising a lid (40) being hingedly connected to the base housing. Pao does not disclose the base housing having an aperture defining a cavity therethrough and a manicure bowl with a front wall, a sidewall and a floor, the manicure bowl being selectively received in the cavity such that front wall of the bowl being flush with an exterior surface of the base housing. Pao also does not disclose one of the adapter heads having linear motion and the lid being at

least partially translucent. Warner et al discloses a nail care system (fig. 1) comprising a base housing (12) having an aperture and defining a cavity therethrough (fig. 1), the base housing also including a drawer (20) inherently being used as a manicure bowl which has a front wall, a sidewall and a floor, the manicure bowl is selectively received in the cavity such that front wall of the bowl being flush with an exterior surface of the base housing at an interface between the front wall and the exterior surface of the base housing. It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the base housing as taught by Warner et al into the nail care system of Pao for the purpose of removing nail polish and it would also have been an obvious matter of design choice to construct one of the adapter heads having linear motion for the intended use purpose. It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the translucent material for the lid, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pao in view of Warner et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sussman (D278367).

With regard to claim 5, Pao in view of Warner et al disclose a nail care system comprising all the claimed limitations in claim 1 as discussed above except for the floor of the manicure bowl being contoured to support a hand and fingers. Sussman

Art Unit: 3732

discloses a manicure bowl (fig. 1) comprising a floor being contoured to support a hand and fingers. It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the contoured floor as taught by Sussman into the nail care system of Pao in view of Warner et al for the purpose of supporting the hand and fingers of the user.

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pao in view of Warner et al as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Blackshear (5787903).

With regard to claims 7-8, Pao in view of Warner et al disclose a nail care system comprising all the claimed limitations in claim 1 as discussed above except for fan disposed in an interior space of the base housing and a heater. Blackshear discloses a manicure system (10) comprising a fan (42) and a heater (46). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the fan and the heater as taught by Blackshear into the nail care system of Pao in view of Warner et al for the purpose of circulating air.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pao in view Warner et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Grimm (4979523).

With regard to claim 9, Pao in view of Warner et al disclose a nail care system comprising all the claimed limitations in claim 1 as discussed above except for at least one of an ultraviolet source. Grimm discloses a nail care system (fig. 1) comprising a

Application/Control Number: 10/633,328

Art Unit: 3732

housing (1) comprising an ultraviolet source (4). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the ultraviolet source as taught by Grimm into the nail care system of Pao in view of Warner et al for the purpose of providing a radiation source which is specific to the purpose of intended.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pao in view of Warner et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Paule (361366).

With regard to claim 11, Pao in view of Warner et al disclose a nail care system comprising all the claimed limitations in claim 1 as discussed above except for the hand tool having a light source disposed thereon. Paule discloses a nail powered hand tool (fig. 1) comprising a light source (38) disposed thereon. It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the light source as taught by Paule into the nail care system of Pao in view of Warner et al for the intended use purpose.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cho is cited to show the state of the art with respect to a nail care system.

The drawings filed 08/01/03 have been approved by the Examiner.

Art Unit: 3732

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robyn Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4711. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robyn Doan April 27, 2005

> John J. Wilson Primary Examiner